DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 872 VT 003 396

AUTHOR	Cohen, Wilbur J.
TITLE	Womanpower Policies for the 1970's. Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program (Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967).
INSTITUTION	Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	13 Apr 67
NOTE	46p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.40
DESCRIPTORS	*Employment Opportunities, Employment Trends, *Job Market, *Labor Force, *Manpower Utilization, Seminars, Womens Education, *Working Women

ABSTRACT

One of a series of proceedings of seminars on Manpower Policy and Program, this report presents a condensed transcript of a seminar. Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen discussed women in the labor force today, future trends in women's employment, future demands for workers, health personnel shortages, educational opportunities, homemaker services needed, and increased freedom of choice in the future. Some of the points were: (1) Economic factors, amount of education, and age of children are major factors which influence married women's decision to work, (2) Of the total labor force growth between 1964 and 1980, about 21 million (87 percent) will be due to population increases and the remainder will be from rising labor force participation rates of adult women, (3) Professional and technical workers, those with the highest average educational attainment, will be the fastest growing occupational group, (4) Acute health personnel shortages will necessitate rethinking training and job requirements to allow for upward and lateral mobility of personnel, (5) More flexible time schedules in both education and jobs, and adequate child-care and homemaker services would allow more women to work, and (6) Skills and knowledge of women will be used more creatively and fully than ever before. A question and answer period followed the address. (CD)

ED042872

SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM

Womanpower Policies for the 1970's

by WILBUR J. COHEN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

VT003396

- This report is one in a series of proceedings of Seminars on Manpower Policy and Program sponsored by the Manpower Administration. It presents a condensed transcript of the seminar held in Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.
- The purpose of the seminars is to provide a platform for guest speakers and for members of the Department of Labor and other agencies concerned with manpower problems to discuss issues arising from the development of an Active Manpower Policy.
- Expressions of opinion by the speaker, the moderator, and those participating from the audience are not to be construed as official opinions of the U.S. Government or the Department of Labor.

ED042872

SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Womanpower Policies for the 1970's

by WILBUR J. COHEN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Willard Wirtz, Secretary
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Manpower Administrator

OPENING REMARKS

Chairman—Mary Dublin Keyserling
Director of the Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor

MRS. KEYSERLING: I am delighted to have this opportunity to open this particular Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program, which is concerned, as you know, with womanpower policies for the 1970's.

How we can more fully use the great national resource represented by the skills and abilities of women in the years ahead should be a major item on the agenda for all of us who are concerned with the development of an active manpower policy. Fortunately, this is a subject of growing interest and concern.

Today nearly half of the Nation's women between the ages of 18 and 65 are in the labor force. The number of women at work has doubled in just the short period since 1940. Despite this, current patterns of the employment of women, unemployment among women, and the underemployment of women led President Johnson a few months ago to comment: "The underutilization of American women continues to be the most tragic and the most senseless waste of this century."

We are fortunate to have the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with us today to talk about the challenge of improved utilization of womanpower. He has been concerned with the development of the human potential throughout his career as a dedicated and outstanding civic servant and as professor of public welfare administration at the University of Michigan. Many of you know his books and his many articles well. The record of his

contribution is written in large and luminous letters in the history of the social security, health, welfare, and education legislation of the last 30 years. His is a record of getting good things done!

It's heartening to have him here with us this afternoon to train his keen insight on the question of womanpower policies for the 1970's. Dr. Wilbur Cohen.

Womanpower Policies for the 1970's

An Address by Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen

DR. COHEN: Thank you, Mrs. Keyserling.

My wife says quite frequently when I am introduced as the Under Secretary of HEW that "W" stands for women. And my concern for these problems and issues really springs from that concern and interest.

This paper I shall read contains a good many statistics. But I think it important to bring them together to give a picture of where we are and where we come from in order to see where we might be going during the seventies in the growth of womanpower.

Womanpower is one of the Nation's important assets and one of its great potentials. Women have been responsible for the major share of the growth in the labor force, representing 60 percent of the total increase since 1940. They now represent one-third of all workers. The increase in the number of women in the labor force is one of the most significant indicators of the economic, social, and political changes that are occurring in our dynamic society.

What have been some of the factors that have contributed to this revolution in womanpower? The economy has been healthy and growing; science and technology advancing; the urban population expanding; educational opportunities broadening; social values, attitudes, patterns of marriage and childbearing changing; and life expectancy increasing. Women are being freed from routine monotonous housework. They are better educated and trained, and more jobs are available.

The increasing importance of women as a major segment of the labor force also has implications in terms of economic growth, the distribution of income, tax yields, labor supply, and birth rates.

Today women are represented in every professional field—and many hold top posts in government, business, and the health, education, and welfare fields. Some work in supermarkets; others are mathematicians and physicists; others care for patients in hospitals and nursing homes. Women teach the young and the old. They work on assembly lines, in offices, and in restaurants. Some are Senators, Representatives, and Governors. They have been cabinet members and in some countries have been and are Prime Ministers and the ruling heads of empires. There are fewer and fewer "Men Only" occupations left in the world today. In fact, in many occupations, women outnumber the men—and in the future this may be true in many more occupations.

Women in the Labor Force Today

The actual growth of women in the labor force has been phenomenal. In 1965, 27 million women were in the labor force—about twice as many as before World War II; 45 percent of the women between 18 and 64 were working or looking for employment. Older women, 45 to 64 years of age, have shown the greatest tendency to start or return to work. Since 1940, the number of older working women has more than tripled. More than one-half of those aged 45 to 54 are in the labor force. Most women work before they get married, leave paid employment after they marry, raise children, and then many return to paid employment when the children are school age. And I think this practice of women returning to the labor force is becoming more prevalent.

Improvements in educational opportunities have been a significant factor in the increase of working women. Schooling above the elementary level, at one time beyond the reach of many, is now generally available to all. Moreover, there is growing awareness that only through higher educational achievements can women reach their full potential in social, cultural, and economic spheres.

There is a direct relationship between educational attainment of women and their labor force participation. The more educa-

tion a woman has, the greater the likelihood that she will be engaged in paid employment.

In March 1965, 72 percent of all women who had completed 5 or more years of college, and 54 percent of all women with 4 years of college were in the labor force. In contrast, only 24 percent of all women with less than 8 years of elementary education were employed or seeking work. The possibility of being employed was even less among women who had fewer than 5 years of formal education.

Unusually high rates of labor force participation are shown both for women 45 to 54 years of age with 5 or more years of college (84 percent) and for women 20 to 24 years of age with 4 or more years of college (82 percent).

A principal change in the composition of the labor force and the most important source of its growth has been the greater participation of married women. In 1950, about one-third of all married women were working; today nearly one-half are contributing to the family's income.

There has also been a tremendous increase in the labor force participation of mothers of children under age 18. Between 1940 and 1964, the number of working mothers increased sixfold. Today more than one-third of all mothers are working. Even in husband and wife families, 23 percent of the mothers with children under 6 years of age were working in 1964. The proportion is almost twice that (43 percent) when the children are 6 to 17 years of age.

In families where, in 1964, the mother was widowed, separated, or divorced and had children under 18, 56 percent of the mothers worked. Most of these women are dependent on their own earnings for the support of their families. Thus, even when they had children under 3 years of age, 37 percent of these mothers were working.

Although there are a number of factors which influence a married woman's decision to work, economic factors seem to be the most significant. Several years ago I participated in a study with James Morgan and others, of the labor force participation of

wives, in which we found that the level of the husbands' incomes exerts a powerful effect on the proportion of wives working.[1] The higher the income without the wife working, the less likely she is to work.

A later study of Morgan's showed that the effects of the woman's age, education, and husband's income are the most significant determinants in the wife's decision to work. Many people are not aware of this study, called *Productive Americans,*[2] which came out last year. It is a very interesting study on this whole matter.

The study found that wives of advanced age or wives with young children at home are less likely to be working. As for wives under age 65, the main factors influencing whether they worked outside of the home were their own formal education, since education makes more pleasant, well-paying jobs available, and their husband's income which, if high enough, makes a job unnecessary. Wives with more formal education whose husbands earn less than $10,000 were the group most likely to be working.

Although there are many motivating factors, depending on the individual, most women do say they work because they want the money. They want to improve the family's standard of living. They want to help send their children to college, or they want to help buy a new house. And it is true that, in most cases, the additional income of the wife has helped raise the family's standard of living. Employed married women now earn more than one-fifth of their family's total income.

Yet there are other motivating factors that are sometimes overlooked. Many women work because they want a certain degree of financial independence and freedom. Also many women, faced with increasing amounts of leisure time, want to make constructive and creative use of this time. As we look into the future, this aspect of increasing leisure time may become an even more compelling motivating factor than the economic one.

---

[1] James N. Morgan, and others, *Income and Welfare in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962).

[2] Nancy Baerwaldt, James N. Morgan, and Ismail Sirageldin, *Productive Americans* (Ann Arbor, Mich: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1966), Survey Research Monograph 43.

Future Trends in Employment of Women

It is clear that not only are women in the world of work increasing in number but they will make up an even greater part of the labor force in the future. Increasing labor force participation rates will be responsible for more than half the projected growth of women in the labor force between 1964 and 1970. Almost half the people added to the labor force in this period will be women, assuming a 17-percent net increase in the number of women coming into the labor force as compared with a 9-percent increase in men entrants.

As in the past, employment is likely to rise most rapidly among middle-aged women whose family responsibilities have lightened. However, a 55-percent increase is also expected in the number of working mothers aged 20 to 24 with children under 6.

But what are the implications of these trends—particularly the increasing participation of middle-aged women and young mothers with young children? For what kinds of employment will these women be needed? Is our society and our economy really prepared to make it possible for women to take jobs and to meet their other family and societal needs?

First, let us take a look at the general manpower development, issues, and problems that are expected to emerge in the coming decade. Projections of population growth in the United States reach 226 million in 1975 and 245 million in 1980. Gross national product, now at $750 billion, will reach over $1,000 billion by 1975 or thereabouts. To supply that many people with steadily rising incomes and the goods and services they require and demand, we will need 94 million workers in 1975 and 101 million workers in 1980.

Of the total labor force growth between 1964 and 1980, about 21 million (87 percent) will be due to population increases, and the remainder will be due to the continued rising labor force participation rates of adult women. The Department of Labor predicts that since a large part of the projected increase of 24 million in the total labor force between 1964 and 1980 will consist of those groups—young workers and adult women—for

whom part-time work is prevalent, the number of part-time workers will increase greatly. Many of these workers will be inexperienced and will be seeking jobs at the bottom step of the career ladder. There will be stiff competition for available jobs both among large numbers of youth and between youth and older women.

If a sufficient number of part-time jobs and jobs requiring lower skill levels are not forthcoming, the projected increase in labor force activity of married women may not be realized, since the labor force participation rate among this group is to some extent dependent on the availability of the desired type of job for that particular person.

By 1975, many more people concentrated in large urban clusters will be in the labor force. The agricultural work force will decline. The manufacturing work force may increase in the first decade, but overall will decline as a percentage of the total. The service sector will grow.

The role and pace of technology will continue to escalate the level of skills demanded in many areas. However, jobs will be restructured and for many workers the demand for intrinsic ability will be lessened even though frequent ad hoc training and reorientation for job shifts may be required. Occupational mobility will be required to permit subprofessional workers to move up the career ladder to more highly skilled positions in the same occupation.

Many more jobs and new kinds of jobs will have to be created and mechanisms for continuous training and retraining for adults must be established—regardless of their original formal schooling. This continuing training program will involve a greater percentage of the work force than is involved at the present time. (For example, in Western European countries slightly more than 1 percent of their work forces are continually in retraining programs as compared to a fraction of 1 percent in the United States.) A larger share of training costs may have to be borne by the private sector.

But overall, there should be many more jobs for many more people. Ready and free access to training will be needed, however, to give them economic and social choices and mobility.

Future Demands for Workers

But what workers will be in demand?

Professional and technical workers—those with the highest average educational attainment—will be the fastest growing occupational group. The greatest demand will be for teachers—particularly college teachers. All the health service occupations will be desperate for workers. The demand for many types of service workers will continue to increase. Allied health personnel, clerical, and sales people will increase in great number.

Turnover will continue to be highest in the occupations in which young women are employed because they leave the labor force to get married. In fact, the number needed for replacements will be greater than the number needed for additional jobs. For example, about 8 percent of all elementary school teachers need to be replaced each year, but the net growth requirement is estimated to be only 2 percent annually from 1964 to 1975.

The demand for skilled, highly trained and educated workers will continue and the opportunities for those with little education will decline drastically to a level far lower than even today. Mental skills, rather than physical labor, will distinguish the jobs of the future, thus improving woman's ability to compete for these jobs.

Women workers will increase about 41 percent in this period as compared with a 27-percent increase for men. A total of 30 million women in 1970 and over 36 million women in 1980 will be working or looking for work. The proportion of women working will increase from the present 37 percent to 39 percent in 1970, and to 41 percent in 1980—and I might point out the success in carrying out the Great Society programs of the next decade will depend to a great extent on these women.

One of the errors of present-day society is the underutilization of women's skills, which may have resulted from a number of factors. Old myths about a woman's intelligence and performance still persist, although some progress has been made in beating them down. Recent legislation and other activities portend future progress in lowering the blocks and barriers to women's full access to employment opportunities. Progress has been made

in the expansion of training opportunities under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and the Economic Opportunity Act, but many more opportunities must be provided to help women continue their learning and update their skills.

In the coming decade, womanpower will become more important and it is essential that this valuable resource be utilized to its fullest capacity.

As we advance with new health, education, and welfare programs, we shall find, as we already have today, that their success depends on competent people to implement them, and this will depend on utilizing more and more women. We live in the age of automation. Computers do many tasks that were once reserved for human beings, and although they will do even more so in the future we will still need more human brainpower.

In the health services field the need for trained man and woman power—particularly womanpower—is critical.

Health Personnel Shortages

The latest estimates indicate a present shortage of 50,000 physicians and equally serious deficiencies throughout the whole spectrum of the health professions. At the present planning levels of medical schools, we should have approximately 360,000 physicians in 1975, but we will need about 400,000.

In the United States today there are about 93,000 dentists; by 1975, some 140,000 will be needed. Despite the great need for dental care, the ratio of dentists to the population has been declining for some time and is especially low in rural areas. Maintaining even present ratios of dentists to the population would require doubling the present output of 3,200 a year.

Today there are 600,000 nurses; by 1975, we should have 920,000.

The possibility of having enough physicians, dentists, and nurses within the next decade or even longer to meet the ever-growing demands is remote. Thus, it is imperative that we make better

use of the manpower we have. And we must rely more heavily on the use of allied and supporting health personnel.

There are acute shortages, however, of auxiliary personnel also. Even today we need:

—over 9,000 additional medical technologists.
—over 4,000 additional physical therapists.
—over 4,000 additional dieticians.
—over 42,000 licensed practical nurses.
—over 48,000 hospital aides and orderlies.

By 1975, we will need:

—twice the present number of medical technologists.
—three or four times as many dental hygienists.
—eight or ten times as many medical record librarians, occupational therapists, and physical therapists.

While medical science and technology are advancing at an ever-increasing rate, many people are not benefiting from these advances, principally because of health personnel shortages. One of the solutions to this problem is to increase the supply of personnel and improve the utilization and efficiency of the supply.

A number of steps are being taken to develop vitally needed health personnel. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Bureau of Health Manpower has been established to focus on the manpower needs of the health industry, which will be a $50 billion business in 1970.

The Bureau has been directed to stimulate the development of health manpower resources throughout the Nation to the end that needed health services are available to all of the American people.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Veterans' Administration, and the Office of Economic Opportunity are intensifying their efforts to meet health manpower needs. Working together, these agencies have developed programs which will train 224,000 health workers in federally supported programs in fiscal year 1967. This is almost

100,000 more than last year and the programs will include refresher courses for some 30,000 inactive nurses and technologists.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and the Nurse Training Act are already having an impact. Yet to be realized are the effects of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act.

Last year 7,400 medical students were graduated; 7,500 are estimated for this year—and efforts should be made to encourage the training of more women physicians.

Thirty-five thousand students were graduated from nursing classes in 1965; this year about 1,000 more are expected to be graduated.

This year 9,400 medical students and 57,600 nursing students were admitted to professional schools.

But we must begin to use manpower and womanpower in new and different ways. And many new opportunities for women can be developed.

Under a physician's supervision, professional nurses can carry out many of the routine tasks that now take up so much of the physician's time. Licensed practical nurses could do many of the time-consuming routine duties of the professional nurse. This would not only be a more economical and efficient distribution of labor but also the patient would benefit from the additional attention devoted to him. Physicians' assistants could perform tasks of inestimable value. Dental assistants can prepare fillings and do some of the laboratory work that takes up much of the dentist's time.

But one of the problems that must be explored is the system of barriers which prevent many health workers from moving up the career ladder. Many health jobs are now dead-end jobs. But they need not be so. Poor prospects for advancement aggravate recruitment problems. We need research on "lateral and upward career mobility" to break down some of these barriers.

A registered nurse, for example, can move up in her career to a supervisory position but she cannot easily move into another

discipline such as physical therapy. If she wants to do so, she has to go back and start all over again.

A licensed practical nurse has even less opportunity to advance. Although she can perform some of the duties of the registered nurse, she cannot become a registered nurse unless she goes back and starts from the beginning.

Why shouldn't she be able to take prescribed science courses after a number of years of experience, pass the necessary examination, and become a registered nurse? The same might be true for a dental assistant who could be given the opportunity to become a dentist. Could credits for dental assistant training or experience be given toward a 4-year course in dentistry?

What system could be devised to give credit for work experience—skills acquired on the job—to help people advance in a professsion? Could equivalency examinations be developed to permit them to advance without taking academic coursework all over again?

But in the nursing, teaching, and the social work professions, for example, all regard educational qualifications to be absolutely essential. And this makes it much more difficult—or as difficult as it is now—for women in their thirties and fourties who have taken care of their family responsibilities and want to enter or reenter the professions. Many have to go back to school for 1 or 2 years to meet the educational requirements to enter these professional fields.

Much research must be done on the evaluation of work experience as compared with professional schooling. This is one of the important job development problems we face.

At the same time, of course, standards of professional quality must be preserved. State licenser bodies, professional groups, and employing institutions must be consulted and help develop training and hiring procedures.

I believe upward and lateral mobility are vital necessities if we are going to attract people to these jobs and retain them in the profession. And women will be the greatest benefactors of this enlightened approach.

Similarly, the shortages of teachers and social workers are approaching crisis proportions. In these fields, also, we must do more to encourage the use of supporting personnel—teacher aides, social workers aides, and other trained nonprofessionals.

In addition to the valuable family experience many women can bring to these jobs, experience that is particularly pertinent to the whole field of health, education, and welfare, these positions can offer many middle-aged and young women creative outlets for their interests and abilities. In all these fields we must explore how the nonprofessional aspects of many professional jobs can be taken over by less highly trained, supervised workers. Specialized training and higher labor standards, lending more prestige and status, would provide incentive for women to take these jobs.

Certainly, as I have tried to point out, there will not be any shortage of jobs for women in the 1970's. Steps must be taken, however, to help them prepare for these jobs and to facilitate their entry or reentry into the job market. More efforts must be devoted to developing new and expanded services—education, training, counseling, and child and family services.

Educational Opportunities

Recent efforts to expand educational opportunities for the Nation's citizens—children and adults, alike—will significantly improve the status of women in the future. A good education within the reach of all children, beginning early in life, will have lasting effects. And more opportunities for diversified, comprehensive, and flexible adult education are also being provided.

But additional opportunities must be provided for women to continue their education, even while they are still raising their families and not actively seeking work. They should be able to pick up their education at whatever point they left off—elementary, high school, or college—part time or full time. I think universities, colleges, junior colleges, correspondence schools, and technical institutes should develop much more intensive programs for this continuing education. These institutions should put some women on their staffs who will be really concerned about these problems

and not try to force women into the full-time, regular procedure that young people who do not have family responsibilities are expected to follow. Then, when women are ready to go back into the labor force, refresher and retraining courses flexibly arranged to suit their personal and family demands also should be available—including some institutes on Saturday, so that the husband can stay home and take care of the children while the wife attends class.

Counseling services should be available to guide women into the occupations which will best fit their interests and abilities. Many women must make new and difficult decisions when they return to work, or even while they are going to school. Their choices are becoming broader and everchanging. Awareness of alternatives can be the determining factor in whether or not women's abilities will be used to the maximum. Imaginative counseling, helping women make the right decisions, can evoke and realize many talents that otherwise would be buried.

Mrs. Keyserling and I have been talking over the last couple of years about the whole problem of how to bring vocational information to women who have been out of the job market for 10 or 15 years. I think there is a particularly difficult informational problem. People who are in the labor force, or who are in a job, might take much for granted, but a woman who has been out for 10 or 15 years might feel insecure, or lack the knowledge about the opportunities available. I think we need special people and special ways to get information about the opportunities and the alternatives to women who have been out of the labor force so that they can make intelligent decisions as to what they might do. I don't think we can rely entirely on women's intuition to make the right decision in a dynamically changing job market with vastly changing opportunities.

One of the questions we are asking right now is how many more inactive registered nurses would return to nursing duties if more hospitals would permit them to work part time or on a more flexible basis?

Getting employers, unions, and even the Federal Government to adopt more flexible working arrangements is a real problem.

Even many supervisors in the Federal Government are quite unwilling to make the adjustment that is necessary to permit a woman with family responsibilities to have flexible hours or workweeks. Changing the employers' attitudes will involve some retraining, but I feel their attitudes will change as the shortages become more apparent.

Now, crucial to all of our efforts to give women the opportunity to go to work if they choose is the provision of adequate day-care and homemaker services. The need for day-care services is reaching mounting proportions. The arrangements that working mothers make for the care of their children are of vital importance to the family and the entire Nation, and, I would say, to the future of our country.

A survey of 6 million mothers who worked in 1964, representing the mothers of one-fifth of all children under 14, showed that only 2 percent of the children were in group care. Significantly, family income made little difference as to whether the child was cared for in group programs.

As more and more mothers return to work, as it is predicted they will, the lack of day-care services will be one of our most serious unmet needs.

Some progress is being made under the child welfare provisions of the 1962 public welfare amendments to the Social Security Act, which authorized Federal grants-in-aid to State public welfare agencies for day-care services.

However, we still have far to go in providing adequate care. Although 52 States and jurisdictions today have moved forward to provide day-care facilities, they serve less than half a million children. Yet there are nearly 3 million children who need the care and protection that day care offers because they are in one-parent families, or because both parents work and the family has a marginal income.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has also encouraged Community Action Programs to develop day-care centers for young children. And I think Project Head Start has provided a wonderful opportunity to assure many children the care and educational

experience that they need to help them develop their full potential. And I would hope in the next few years that the Head Start and day-care services would be two of the very, very important educational social services that would be expanded.

Homemaker Services Needed

This year President Johnson has recommended to the Congress proposals which would further encourage day-care services—including the training of people for new careers in child care and the establishment of parent-child centers. These new careers in child care will not only help the child and his mother but will provide meaningful employment for many economically and emotionally deprived women and give them an opportunity to make an important contribution to their community and to children.

There is also a growing demand for homemaker services. Although day-care services are being expanded, homemakers are still needed to care for children at home when they are ill. Homemakers will be called upon increasingly to help young mothers with infant children and mothers who are ill and not able to cope with their responsibilities. The homemaker, as a part of a homemaker team that includes professional workers—visiting nurses, social workers, home economists, physicians, and therapists—provides a vital service in seeing families through crises.

There is a possibility that as more women return to work there will be more stresses and strains on the family, although it should be recognized that the shrinking workweek and the availability of more and better part-time jobs predicted for the future will make it easier for many women to lead a double life. Nevertheless, for many families, homemaker services will still be needed to help safeguard, protect, stabilize, and unify families.

The growth of homemaker services in the United States as compared with Great Britain, for example, has been slow, but encouraging progress is being made. In 1963, there were about 300 public and private agencies employing 4,000 homemakers. Today we have about 10,000 full-time homemakers in 700 agencies. But if every community needs them—and I think every com-

munity does need them—we must have an estimated 200,000 homemakers.

Child-care and other family services are needed in all communities, by all kinds of families—rich and poor and sometimes whether the mother works or not. If this need is not met, the cost of society's failure may be immeasurable in human terms.

More Choices in the Future

I have tried to present a very, very broad and illustrative picture of what I think is possible in the area of womanpower in the 1970's. I think women have shared (although not equally with men) in the significant advances that have been made in the 20th century. And I think that in the coming decades they will finally receive their full share. Their skills and knowledge will be used more creatively and fully than ever before. In a rapidly growing economy, women will have a chance to develop their individual capacities and earn a good livelihood, and family life will be strengthened by it.

The world of the 1970's will be vastly different than the world we know today. But it will be an exciting period, providing a rich and rewarding climate. Within the past few years we have begun to strive for a new type of society—a more diversified, pluralistic society; the kind of society which offers each individual a greater choice of what he may do with his life; a society that helps each individual develop his capacities to their fullest so that he or she can exercise meaningful choices freely.

By the beginning of the next decade the Nation's affluence shall reach an unprecedented level. And I look forward to that time.

Personal incomes will have climbed steadily. The time that a worker spends on the job will have declined. The extent of poverty in this country will have either been minimized or eliminated.

Job patterns will be reshaped. Leisure and the opportunity to enjoy it will be distributed over the lifetime of the individual and the family so that, for instance, these same families will be able to take more vacations together. More meaningful leisure time activi-

ties will be readily available, serving the diversified and creative needs of the community. Schools and colleges will be open evenings and, I hope, weekends, to meet the community's educational, recreational, and cultural interests.

The freedom to choose the size and spacing of one's family will become a reality for the poor as well as for the affluent. Family planning services will be available to all, irrespective of income. With childbearing and childrearing completed by many women while they still have many years of life ahead, the possibilities of their resuming interrupted careers, of beginning new ones, or of contributing to meaningful volunteer activities will provide them with a new dimension of choice in their lives.

This increased freedom of choice—which is the main point of what I am saying—this increased freedom of choice, both for women and for men, will contribute to and be reinforced by a strengthening of the family, a strengthening of parental responsibility, the expansion of continuing education, and the development of a greater sense of civic obligation and community responsibility.

A whole new age of individualism, creativity, and diversity—a way of life which is beginning to develop in this decade—will flourish in the 1970's. We have embarked on an adventure to provide the conditions that lead to, foster, and nurture individual fulfillment.

In this new age of enlightenment, women will become a more vital economic, political, and social force.

Thank you.

DISCUSSION PERIOD

MRS. KEYSERLING: I know I speak for all of us when I say how grateful we are to the Under Secretary for his thorough review, and for his heartwarming picture of the future—it sounds very exciting—and for his many challenges and suggestions for the better use of our womanpower.

I know what he has said has evoked a great many questions in your minds. Who would like to start the ball rolling?

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Under Secretary, did I hear you say anything about tax benefits for working women?

DR. COHEN: No, I did not touch on that subject but I have looked into it. Of course, nearly every group wants some kind of tax credits and tax advantages. And I think that there is some basis for tax credits for working women, especially when they have to pay for day care for their children. But I would stress the development of free community day-care services.

I might add that my wife worked for the last 2 years and it cost me a lot of money. So I am not entirely opposed to the idea of tax credits for working women. When we were making out the income tax recently, she would not believe that I had to pay to enable her to work for 2 years.

FROM THE FLOOR: Did she put you in too high an income bracket?

DR. COHEN: Yes. There are many extra costs when a woman goes to work—transportation, clothes, and many other things—but the major emphasis on the tax point is when a woman works and has to have someone care for the children. But I would certainly urge that tax credits not be given to the point where they would argue against the development of services in the community for

women on a free or partially paying basis. I am very strong for day-care services and centers, and although the women or family should perhaps somehow pay part of the costs, I don't want to see them only available for people who can afford to pay them.

FROM THE FLOOR: I would like to second what you say about women being a minority group, in the professional field at least. One of my coworkers was pointing out that this is not true. But I think most of us professional women do testify to the problems that are involved.

Nevertheless, I would like to play the devil's advocate to a slight extent.

In preparing the *Manpower Report* we came across two trends which led me to wonder what was ahead, and I would like your reaction to them. In the next decade there is going to be such an unprecedented increase in the number of men in the labor force that our statisticians were projecting a possible need for more men to go into traditionally women's professions. And this led me to hope that we might get a breakdown of this segmentation.

The other problem is quite different and concerns the planning of the new ghetto programs, trying to allocate training facilities, limited as they are, among groups in the broken home situations that you get in many of the ghettos. We have had a good deal of discussion about strategy.

More Men in Traditionally Women's Occupations

DR. COHEN: You raise a very pertinent and important question. If I were giving another speech, my speech would be about more men in women's occupations.

Frank Keppel, when he was Commissioner of Education, and I racked our brains for many years trying to retain more men and bring more men into the teaching profession. I think it is highly essential that teaching not be thought of as solely a woman's occupation. I think we need many more men in the elementary and secondary school system. And I want to make the point that I think this will also benefit women. More men in the nursing field, social

work, and teaching occupations will raise the salary level for women as well as men.

When an occupation is 90 percent women, the employer and the men will rationalize a lower pay scale for that occupation. I think that increasing the proportion of men will make it possible to pay women more as well as to bring both more women and men into the occupation.

I think the same is true in social work. There should be more men to deal with problems of youth delinquency (the whole gang task force approach) and to deal with the problems in the ghettos. Competition between men and women in these occupations is a good thing.

But I do think that you do have to take into account the hours of work and the workweek. If the workweek continues to go down, let's say to 37½ hours a week on the average or maybe to 35 in two decades, it will also be easier for women to compete. And I think it is much easier for women to compete today on a 40-hour workweek basis than it was on the 48-hour workweek that existed prior to World War II.

So there will be more competition. And I think that in professions where the competition is particularly important, the entry of more men in the traditionally women's professions will be stimulating.

Now, maybe there are other areas in the service industries, and in some of the other fields, where this may not apply. But overall, I would say that kind of competition will be good.

MRS. KEYSERLING: We have noted a very rapid increase in the number of men teachers and administrators coming into the high schools. Men have virtually taken over the principalships of the senior high schools, and now there are increasing numbers in these posts in the junior high schools. We have had a very rapid entry of men into the social work profession. I agree that these are highly desirable trends. All professions should be open to men and women alike.

But one of the problems that we are very much concerned with in the Women's Bureau is that while these trends have been taking

place, opportunities in other fields have not opened up to a sufficient degree to replace these possibilities for highly skilled and trained women. And this is one of the reasons why we have seen a decline in the relative proportion of women in the professions.

In 1950, women constituted 45 percent of those in the professions. Today they are only 36 percent. This is a very rapid and sharp decline. A slight reversal in this trend is beginning to be manifested. We still see relatively little relaxation of a "quota" system, if I may call it that, for the admission of women into the law schools. Only 3 percent of our lawyers are women. And there is very little improvement there.

You spoke of the need for an improvement of admissions policies in the medical schools. This is a particularly interesting question. Before World War II, 5 percent of the entering class in the medical schools were women and the medical schools tell us that women are now nearly 9 percent of total acceptances.

But it's important to note, however, that there has been almost a threefold increase in the number of women applicants as opposed to about a 50-percent increase in the number of men applicants. In other words, the number of women applicants has increased at about a six-times-more-rapid rate than men applicants. So that the chance of a woman applicant being admitted to a medical school is considerably less today that it was back in 1940.

One of the questions we might pose to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is, "What can be done to stimulate a reevaluation of admissions policies in the professional schools?"

We see this problem reflected in the fact that a much smaller percentage of our college teachers today are women than in 1940, in 1930, or even than in 1920. Women as a ratio of the total faculty are about where they were in 1910. This represents pretty serious underutilization of womanpower.

How can we challenge our schools both to increase the total number of facilities to meet the demand for more professional and technical people, and to take a different attitude toward limitations which deter women applicants?

DR. COHEN: I think that quite a number of things have to be done. You have to consider the interaction of a small number of outstanding graduate schools that are very much concerned about the quality of education and the training of research people. The only way you can break down some of the barriers is to have more schools and colleges.

In other words, you can't rely on Berkeley and Columbia and Harvard and Princeton, the top 100 of the 2,200 institutions. You have to build a lot more institutions throughout this country so that there can be both more men and women admitted.

And unless you can do that, unless you can expand the whole area of community colleges and smaller colleges—and that means private colleges as well as public ones—I think these top 100 or 200 will concentrate on high-level professional applicants, research people, and graduate students, so that they have to limit admissions to the very top people.

This really means a tremendous reevaluation of our whole construction and faculty expansion during the next 15 years.

College Admission Preferences

The other thing is when you talk to people on faculties, they will tell you that if you have the hypothetical case in which only one more person will be admitted to a college and a man and a woman are the two candidates, and for the sake of argument they are both equal in terms of their ability, the college will take the man simply because there is a greater probability that the man will have more years and more time in whatever the particular profession is.

How to overcome this factor is a very difficult problem. You must have more college openings. As long as there is a shortage of openings in the colleges, the faculty admissions committee—and I have been on faculty admissions committees—all other things being equal, will stress the length of working life factor. You must expand faculties and expand openings for people in the universities.

MRS. KEYSERLING: Don't you have to tell them a little bit more, too, of the changing facts of life? You spoke of the fact that over

80 percent of our women between the ages of 45 and 65 who have had 5 or more years of higher education are in the labor force. These women stay at work. The percentage of these highly educated women at work, even in the peak childbearing years, does not fall more than a few percentage points below two-thirds. The difference between their stay in the labor force and man's work life expectancy has narrowed to a most extraordinary degree. There is only a few years difference. It seems to me that we have to make these facts relating to women's work performance better known to those who determine admissions if attitudes are to change. Don't you agree?

DR. COHEN: Oh, yes. For example, the shortage occupations, at least in the areas that I am especially concerned with, are vitally related to the quality of life. I was not dealing with the question here of whether you need more women to go into dimestore work, or to be clerks, or something else. I am trying to make the point that the most vital continuation of a satisfactory human existence in the kind of society we have now depends on more people in what are the occupations particularly suitable for women, not only occupations in which women are in some respects even more capable than men, but in which both men and women are vitally necessary if you are going to carry out the expansion of medical care to everybody, and education for everyone, and community social services for families.

FROM THE FLOOR: You used the phrase right there, Mr. Under Secretary, "suitable for women." I just came from a meeting, also in the Labor Department, of the Secretary's Committee on Specialized Personnel, in which various studies were being cited to show all the shortages of technicians in engineering and science.

And the point has been made that less than 1 percent of the scientists and engineers of the country are women, and that the great openings provided by the new community colleges are not being taken advantage of by women either. Even though you can go out to countless high schools and find equal numbers of profiles—psychological profiles of aptitude and ability—among girls that are just as strong in terms of technological portent as those among men, the mores of society are not encouraging or even per-

mitting young ladies of that potential to consider certain occupations—you will find all kinds of Shakespearean scholars who had profiles of great scientists.

Now, is that part of the creative federalism concept that you are thinking of bringing about in changing "society" here? Or are we going to stay in the romanticism of the past in terms of the potential of women?

DR. COHEN: Well, my paper did not discuss the element of romance. But I think that of course there has to be a changed attitude on the part of young women about going into these occupations. And I think that is dependent upon changed attitudes of men as well. There is an interaction there, I am sure, that is extremely complex.

You talk about changing the mores of the situation. I still think that it is important. We have to be sure that we do not undermine the importance of motherhood and family responsibilities. I don't want to say work is more important to a young woman than getting married and having a family.

Now, the more important thing that I have seen on the horizon in the last couple of years is the whole movement for family planning, which is coming more out into the open. And public policy generally, I think, will make it possible for some of these changed attitudes to occur. There are a lot of other things going on, but that seems to me to be one of the most radical and one of the most significant. In that way, women and men can think of occupational choice and family responsibilities and spacing of children in a much more conscious and significant way.

This may well have some impact upon vocational choice of women. But I am afraid that it has to start way back—our present generation has to change its attitudes so that young people will change their values. And I must say I see that only occurring at a very slow rate.

FROM THE FLOOR: Then, Mr. Under Secretary, aren't there implications in what you are saying and what this gentleman has just said for guidance; that we on the Federal level and in the Office of

Education must have money, if ordered to travel out into the fertile fields and have dialogues with those people who are working with the youngsters and those girls in high school? There has to be dialogue. And I think this is one of the weaknesses that we have. And if we in Health, Education, and Welfare don't give this type of leadership and send out people to inform our State and local regions, I don't think we are meeting our responsibilities.

MRS. KEYSERLING: Mr. Under Secretary, you might like to know that the Office of Education and the Women's Bureau joined recently in sponsoring two very important regional conferences of guidance people to do just that. One was held in Chicago and one in Philadelphia. Leading guidance people were invited from seven surrounding States. We have been delighted that a considerable number of similar State conferences, modeled after these two conferences, have since been called by guidance people and educators themselves. I agree we need much more dialogue. I could not refrain from pointing out to this group that such meetings are underway and our conference experience underscored the need for such discussions.

DR. COHEN: One of the things I tried to stress in my talks and my papers is the tremendous need and importance of women in many occupations. If you want to change attitudes of people in the community, you must also make these jobs for women not merely important, but essential. You must convert from the idea that the woman is doing an ordinary routine job to the idea that these jobs are really essential to the quality of American life.

To do this you also have to change parental attitudes, which convey this sense of importance to young girls and to the community.

FROM THE FLOOR: I think the most important element in changing the mores of society could well be the attitude of women themselves. Perhaps they have not really aspired to the extent that you might think from listening to the more articulate and more successful women. On a large level, aspirations are really quite low. This is a variable situation I think the Government can do very little to manipulate. I don't think that the problem is one of discrimination in the policies.

Need to Change Parental Attitudes

DR. COHEN: In order to change the aspiration level of the woman, you have to change the aspiration level of the father and mother. It isn't simply the girl who says, "What difference does it make?" or "I don't want to go to school." It was the father and the teacher and the mother and Aunt Bessie and someone who said that to her while she was growing up. And that is why you have to talk about jobs being important and meaningful to the whole maintenance of our society. It is not just becoming a lawyer or an engineer because that pays a lot of money. It has to be that you are rendering a really significant contribution to human life.

FROM THE FLOOR: The question really is, "Is there any really significant future contribution that a woman can make that is in any way more important to society than her role as a wife and mother?" With the extension of the time left for the woman to raise a family, and in her early thirties still seek renewed education for a 20- or 25-year workspan, what we may really need to do is devise new strategies to promote the idea that a woman has a unique opportunity to have both a family and a career on a professional level.

DR. COHEN: We ought to hear some women on this.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Under Secretary, I do not think much has been said about imaginative job development in part-time work. I think that would take care of a lot of professional women and even subprofessional women. I have met many lawyers and other women with good training who have young children at home who probably would work part time if they could make a good contribution, and at the same time not lose out with their families. There is a lot in the part-time field that can be done for women, and it is not being done.

DR. COHEN: I would like to tie these two ideas together.

I had a most interesting conversation last Sunday with a young college woman which relates to your point. As I analyzed the several hour conversation, this young woman was extremely critical of her mother because the mother did not have a professional career. Now, when you talk about family life, I think there is

interaction today between young people and their parents. I am speaking particularly of mothers, and I don't necessarily see any conflict between a career and family responsibility. I don't think it follows that because women have interests in home and marriage and a career, family life is necessarily weakened. I think that the next generation's pride in the achievement and motivations of parents could be one of the most important elements in strengthening family life.

Now, there might be a little different situation when a mother whose children are under the age of 2 or 3 works. I am speaking mostly about the situation where the children are between 8 and 16. Young people take a sense of pride in their mother's competence and ability. The daughter can say her mother can do more than cook and take care of the house. I guess when you are about 12 or 14, you tend to underestimate all the complex matters that go into household management.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am a kind of refugee from the new horizons; I have been with high school students over at Anacostia this week doing two things—one, handing out the leaflets to the collecting flocks, and the other, taking little polls as I go along. I get a group of five or six together and take a poll of the girls, saying, "What do you want to be when you graduate?" And I have bad news for you, I think. I would say 90 percent said clerk-typist or secretary, by which they really meant clerk-typist. Maybe 5 percent said nurse. And out of about 300, two wanted to be pediatricians, one wanted to be a biochemist, one wanted to be, so help me, an English literary critic, and another one wanted something equally far out.

DR. COHEN: Those are honorable professions.

FROM THE FLOOR: Out of 300 I questioned, this is what I got. Now, you may say, well, this is the District of Columbia; this is where they set their sights; it is in these occupations that jobs are. But I would say, "Do any of you want to be a buyer in a department store?" We have a bit of retail trade here. They never had thought of it. Apparently the teachers and the counselors do not talk to them in terms of what the real grades of employment opportunity are.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can I make a policy question a little more difficult by taking us out of the fairly comfortable position of a relatively tight job market and reminding us that a few years ago we had a rather serious unemployment problem? Even though we have overcome the problem, the growing labor force as opposed to the number of new job openings gave us quite a start. As you are probably aware, there was a recent problem in Ohio with a firm that meant actually to implement the equal employment opportunity provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act.[3] The firm laid off people on the basis of sheer seniority. This meant that many male breadwinners were laid off before secondary, female jobholders were. This caused a union-organized strike of the males. It seems to me that what we have been saying here is nice and comfortable when we talk about professional jobs and nurses, and the sort of thing where there is a very rapidly rising demand and women are going to be necessary to help fill that demand. But do we really mean that women ought to be treated equally when they really are not so necessary, and when they may be taking jobs away from males who may be the principal breadearners of their families?

How do we handle this if we get back into an unemployment problem?

DR. COHEN: I was not arguing that women ought to be treated absolutely equally.

FROM THE FLOOR: I was hoping you were; that is why I worded it that way.

Special Considerations for Women

DR. COHEN: As a matter of fact, I am arguing here that there are a number of factors in the situation that ought to be taken into account. I think that the employers, no matter what the workweek or the workyear is, ought to be willing to make some special concessions for working women. I think that it is probably desirable to have a 5- to 10-hour workweek differential for married working

[3] Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 bars discrimination because of race, color, creed, sex, or national origin in industries engaged in interstate commerce.

women. And, as you know, one of the main reasons women go into teaching, among other reasons, is that it has that advantage. This could be developed further in other occupations and without any discriminatory treatment.

I think it is probable also that with the development in the last couple of years of more scholarship money, some of the difficulties will be overcome. Many women are afraid sometimes, or have been afraid, to go into occupations that are expensive in terms of the cost of professional training. If the cost of this educational training can be borne more by the community rather than by the girl or the family, it is possible that more women will apply for admission to these professional schools.

So I think there are some areas there which require special attention.

I don't know how to solve the question of seniority in a case like that, and I am not even aware of how it finally was decided in that particular case. All I heard about was the strike.

But there are a whole series of additional problems, and I have no solutions for them. For example, there is the problem of what you do about the payment of unemployment insurance to women. On the whole, most people think it is an abuse to pay unemployment benefits to women who come and go in the job market and have a great deal more flexibility in deciding whether they want to work or not work. Women do sometimes get benefits in cases in which, if they were men, they probably would not be paid.

To give an illustration: A woman marries a man who lives in another city and she quits her job to live with her husband in his community where there is no job. Initially she may not get unemployment benefits for a few weeks because she voluntarily left her employment without good cause attributable to the employer, but she may get benefits after 6 weeks. So the fact of the matter is that she gets paid unemployment insurance in another community, not because there was not a job for her in the place where she was working, but because there is not one in the place to which she moved with her husband.

This is the kind of thing that brings a lot of difficulty. I am not trying to answer it, because I cannot. But I do recognize that the

employment of more women will raise new questions and create new problems.

MRS. KEYSERLING: The question suggests that a much larger percentage of women are secondary earners than is in fact the case. It suggests that many women are working more for pin money than because of real economic need. As we consider this, we should be aware of the facts. Of the 27 million women who were at work in March of 1966, over 6 million were single. They worked to support themselves. We don't want to discriminate against them or treat them any differently. Their needs are much the same as those of single men at work. Five and a half million women in the labor force were widowed, separated, or divorced. We are not going to treat them any differently, I trust. They are generally the main breadwinners of their families. Of those who were married and had husbands present, about 22 percent had husbands who were either earning nothing or earning less than $3,000 a year. These women work out of compelling necessity. Another 25 percent had husbands with annual earnings between $3,000 and $5,000. These women were working to meet the basic needs of their families—to take them out of acute poverty, out of privation. Are we going to set the standards any differently for them? I trust not. Or for any women, for that matter?

DR. COHEN: If you follow that line of thinking, employers will say, "All right, we will keep the women who need to work, but those who do not need to work we can lay off."

MRS. KEYSERLING: We should follow it out to a doctrine of equality. We are now committed as a Nation to assure that all those who want work and need work should have it.

FROM THE FLOOR: The whole thrust of the question is, if we are to have equality, do we create different categories of people and pursue equality on that basis, or don't we? And if we don't, are we aware of some of the kinds of problems that this is going to create? Regarding this particular case, I didn't say that the women didn't need the money. I said that the striking male workers said this, and went so far as to go out on strike. As to where it stands at the moment, the Ohio State law will permit the employer to act this way—to keep the males and lay off the females—but the Federal

law forbids it. The strike has been going on for 2 months, and nobody is working.

MRS. KEYSERLING: Well, if there has been only one such strike in the 3 years since the passage of the title VII, I don't think we have a major complaint.

FROM THE FLOOR: That is not the point. The point is that right now we are in a tight job market situation, and it is nice to say that all of these women are going to be needed, especially in these particularly select jobs which actually are a very small proportion of the total employment for women today. I am raising the question of what happens when you have a loose job market with high unemployment, particularly for the high proportion of women who are not in the professional field. What do we do then about the problems that may occur because of the kind of policies we are talking about?

MRS. KEYSERLING: You are raising a question relative to the problem of seniority, and the bumping of workers with longer seniority than others. I think that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) is trying to cope with this particular problem in a way that might be of interest. They have suggested that certain jobs be defined as jobs of particular interest to men, and certain jobs of particular interest to women, and certain jobs of interest to both. They stress that all jobs, however, except in the very few cases where sex is a bona fide occupational qualification, must be open to both men and women if qualified. Seniority lists can be kept in these categories. They don't have to be consolidated on a plantwide basis. I think you are raising, not a general problem, but a specialized problem of how you cope with seniority issues under a fair employment practice law.

DR. COHEN: The only thing I can say to that is that I hope our fiscal, monetary, and economic policy will prevent that kind of a job market situation. Do not forget the last depression, when there were policies in the teaching and other professions stating that if there were two people in the same family working they would not employ a woman as a teacher. So you are quite correct, and I think your husband would agree completely with the idea that full employment and appropriate economic and fiscal policies are needed

to be sure that the situation does not occur. If we did have a loose job market, with more women working, I agree it would be a much more difficult problem today than it was in 1930.

Women—Are they Equal or Special?

FROM THE FLOOR: Is it the suggestion really that women be treated differently in terms of layoffs? I think that is reasonably hard to credit. The implication was that the real problem would come when all the men rise up in arms, and the question is, what are we going to do about it? What we are going to do is enforce collective bargaining and take care of the situation in a normal manner. I don't think the matter of income, where there are two or three earners in the family, ought to enter into the worker's relations with the employer.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am glad the world is that simple.

DR. COHEN: Maybe you should say it *should not* be an issue, but I think what you are saying is that it *could* be an issue under that type of economic situation.

FROM THE FLOOR: This is a very interesting digression, but I would like to speak about the shortage of professional people in the health services that you mentioned earlier, and the need to create jobs. What is being done to redefine what the professional duties of a social worker or some of the other professions are in order to break them down to the working level of the lesser skilled which would create jobs for the subprofessional group and better utilize the professionally trained personnel? I think the nursing profession has done this to some extent. But I was thinking in terms of the social work profession.

DR. COHEN: I think very little is being done, to tell you the truth, since it is very difficult to do. Any time you bring that up with one of these professional groups the first point of discussion is, why are you trying to bring down the quality of professional services? And you really have to tackle the problem from that point of view.

I happen to think, for instance, that it would be possible to have certain types of social workers with only 1 year of training instead of two. I think this is particularly important for married women

coming back into the labor force. It is a little formidable to say to a woman of 38 or 40 that she must go to school 2 full years to get her social work degree, or whatever time is necessary to become a nurse, or maybe a whole year to get her master's degree to go into teaching. I wish we could figure out some way that she could get some credit for experience. I must say that while I have heard a lot of talk about it, I have not heard too many people in those professional fields that are willing to do anything about it. They tend to think it will dilute professional competence.

I don't think it would, but I do think that it needs a lot more exploration.

FROM THE FLOOR: I should think it would truly strengthen the professions, because if you remove some of the clerical work which professional social workers have to do and let them do the more professional things, it could raise the level of the salary that they could command. I should think that, if done properly, it would have a much better result than you suggest.

DR. COHEN: I think education of the professional is a most difficult problem.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Under Secretary, not much has been said about self-employment. I would like to hear any comments you may have on that.

DR. COHEN: There is a great opportunity, I think, for self-employment for both men and women, middle-aged and older. Self-employment lends itself more to flexibility of time, which is exceedingly important. Either a man or woman can sell real estate, for instance, or work in the field of finance, in which their workweek and the workhours are flexible. The service occupations also offer that opportunity.

FROM THE FLOOR: Concerning the problem of attitudes toward women going into particular jobs and aspirations, we could look at it from a number of points of view.

Reference was made earlier to a poll of Anacostia youth, and the response received might not be surprising for that group. Now if the poll had been taken in another area, perhaps out in the suburbs, there would have been an entirely different set for re-

sponses and aspirations in terms of careers that youngsters were interested in.

In other words, you will find quite a difference in attitude among different socioeconomic groups. I believe that is an important factor. I also believe there is a lot of variation from one country to another. Perhaps we could learn something by studying the experiences of other countries in the utilization of womanpower.

DR. COHEN: I do agree with your first point that attitudes toward occupations and lifetime careers and motivations do vary by social class, and I think that is an extremely important point. I don't know, though, that they are necessarily any better or any worse by social class. The psychologists that I know who are working on vocational choice tell me how little we know about the real factors that enter into vocational choice. I am impressed by the random factors that go into the choices. As little as I know about it, the fact is, as has been mentioned, a large part of the problem is lack of information.

I do not think you can have real vocational choice under present circumstances when people do not have any real idea of what the choices are. I do not know positively whether the choices would be any better, but I think they would. My impression or my implicit assumption is that the more information a person has, the more likely his decisions would be intelligent both in regard to their economic interest and society's interest. I would also assume that to some extent the higher the social class and the higher the income, the wider range of choices those people would have, although it still probably would be fairly limited.

I would say, then, that the most important thing is the dissemination of knowledge; guidance and counseling people must transmit more information to more people. The major thrust ought to be, as was true in amendment to the National Defense Education Act a few years ago, to try to bring guidance and counseling of people right down into the fourth grade.

I feel very strongly that the trouble with our present situation is that we are giving guidance and counseling to people at a grade level when motivational and occupational factors have already been

determined. You have to start at a younger age. We might be much better off in a way if we put our limited resources in at the sixth and seventh grade rather than wait until the 12th grade, even though there is need in both of them.

Your second point about differences in attitudes by countries is also very important. Several times when I have been in France and talked about the employment of older people, the employment of women, or working longer and especially working harder, I have been impressed by the fact that all these things are foreign to a Frenchman. He does not quite understand them. The only thing I can say is that these are factors in our own national attitude. Generally speaking, you have to let DeGaulle do what he is going to do anyway, and the French do what they want to do. I think we are going to find that our gross national product is going to continue to go up, and we are going to need these people—older workers and women workers. The most important thing I can say about this is a sentence I had in my paper to which I did not devote too much time. It is important that people are going to work over a longer period of time, and leisure 10 or 20 years from now is not going to be concentrated in the periods from birth until age 21 and from 65 on as is it today.

We are going to change our whole sense of national emphasis and work emphasis so that, I would hope, people will be taking sabbaticals in their forties and fifties—I am particularly for that now —and then maybe the retirement age will be raised. I think maybe women and men might like to work longer, although maybe not as many hours, into their sixties and seventies, providing they have more time off in their forties and fifties.

If this does come to pass, it is possible that women will have a greater participation in the work force. You can see that in the sense of where employers and others are willing to let husbands and wives take vacations together. Vacations are getting somewhat longer, and are now part of the Protestant ethic.

FROM THE FLOOR: A number of us are concerned about the disparity between the expectations that are now arising for the much needed services you spoke of before and the amount of money that not only Congress but the rest of the country seems to be able

to appropriate at this time. Would you and Mrs. Keyserling comment on the use of volunteers, at least during an interim state, until the need is recognized?

Use of Volunteers

DR. COHEN: I am for the use of volunteers on their own merit, without regard to being fill-ins, because I think it is part of the whole process of awakening community interest and concern. The more people in the community, volunteers and others, interested in these problems and working on their solutions, the more likely you are to get public and congressional support.

MRS. KEYSERLING: The growing role of women in voluntary service is an aspect of the growth in choice which you have advocated. I can see a much larger number of both women and men volunteering to assist in a wide range of services as the work-week grows shorter. We should be doing more to involve a greater number of men and women in helping in many fields where unmet needs are so great. There are many more women who could be helpful in our efforts to expand day-care services and in the training of disadvantaged girls and women in the various poverty programs, among many other important community-serving jobs which might be mentioned. There are almost endless, tremendously constructive services to be rendered, to be organized, to be thought through, to be encouraged by Government, as I think we are now increasingly trying to do.

DR. COHEN: I really must underline what you said. Many of the tremendous social improvements of the last 5 years have come from the awakening of public conscience that has arisen out of voluntary activities. We should not underestimate that. We are talking about changes in attitudes and changes in expectation and motivation, and if you want some of them accomplished, you have to disseminate them through a very diffuse system of interpersonal relationships.

FROM THE FLOOR: Despite the fact that people complain about the lack of preparations for certain of our welfare programs and programs for the aged, one of the great gaps in our knowledge today concerns the bottleneck occupations that make it inoppor-

tune to appropriate too much money in support of these areas. I have a feeling that much of the medical costs have gone up so high that the price rise in medical expense may be reflecting a too plentiful supply of money rather than a niggardly amount. One of the great problems facing the Department of Labor is to come to grips with the questions of which are the bottleneck occupations and where do we most need the training to break these walls so that you can appropriately give money and get the services that you want to get, rather than just contribute to a price rise.

FROM THE FLOOR: The Easter Seal National Convention in Pittsburgh last November was very much concerned about the critical shortage of volunteers resulting from women returning to work. It tried to think of all kinds of ways to enlist the services of upper class or upper income bracket Negroes and to utilize every possible resource of volunteers that it could. I think it is rather interesting in terms of what you have been saying about volunteers. This is one of the largest organizations I can think of in the country that uses volunteers, and it was very much concerned about the problem.

DR. COHEN: All of which illustrates how complex the problems of womanpower really are.

I guess I was very courageous to undertake this topic today. I think we probably outlined more problems than we have solutions for. But nevertheless, I think that it is one of the most important aspects of manpower policy for the next decade.

MRS. KEYSERLING: Thank you again, Mr. Under Secretary, for both the courage and the insight you have displayed. You have made this an exceedingly interesting and constructive seminar.

October 1967

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1967 O—277-234

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Copies of this publication or additional information on manpower programs and activities may be obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in Washington, D. C. Publications on manpower are also available from the Department's Regional Information Offices at the addresses listed below.

John F. Kennedy Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203
341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York 10001
Wolf Avenue and Commerce Street, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania 17201
Ninth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309
51 SW. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33130
801 Broad Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
1240 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44199
219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604
911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
411 North Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75201
19th and Stout Streets, Denver, Colorado 80202
300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102
506 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

Curtis C. Aller, Associate Manpower Administrator
for Policy, Evaluation, and Research

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20210

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR